

tion that benzoate of soda as a preservative in foodstuffs is harmless. Truly, it needs defending. Lusk says that the work of a scientist is usually accomplished in a quiet laboratory and without newspaper "notoriety." Possibly true, but has the question of publicity (we take it that this is what Lusk means by newspaper "notoriety") any relation to the actual value of the results of the investigator? In a generation, no man had so much "notoriety" thrust upon him as had Koch. Was it Koch's fault? Lusk does not like to accept Wiley's dictum about things and says that "It did not seem right that the judgment of a single man should be accepted as final scientific truth." Quite so; the judgment of no single man and no set of men, single or otherwise, will ever be accepted as scientific truth. Scientific truth is such per se. Again he says: "In recognition of this fact the Remsen board was appointed by the government." Ostensibly true but not actually true. The Remsen board was appointed through the influence of the borax trust—and most people, probably including Lusk, know that to be the case. It was appointed to determine that benzoate of soda in foods was not injurious. It so determined. The borax trust—and the manufacturers of foodstuffs made from dirty or rotten raw materials were deeeelighted. Incidentally, Lusk states that two ounces of benzoate of soda administered to a goat weighing 80 pounds, killed the goat. But who wants to be the goat? Lusk's variety of perfectly good "high-brow" science is a delightful thing to have about; but what good does it do the people in the effort to secure pure foods? What did Lusk ever do to help the people to get pure foods or to avoid misbranded, impure or incorrectly labeled drugs? What did Professor Chittenden ever do to help along this cause? What did the late Dr. Christian A. Herter ever do? What did Professor Long ever accomplish in the warfare against the adulterated and impure food manufacturer or the dishonest drug maker? "Much ado about nothing"—but the "interests." Wiley, and the Pure Food and Drug law, stand for just one thing: Honesty. Honesty of material, honesty in preparation—the kind of honesty that does not need benzoate of soda to help it—and honesty in the label. Not much is it? If the stuff they put the benzoate of soda in was good and pure, they would not need to put the benzoate of soda in it, would they? Then why all the talk? The general public may have been "completely and absolutely misled" by Dr. Wiley—but the general public does not think so! And, moreover, we can not but sympathize with Lusk's goat!

Ye fortunate mortals who have patients sitting in your reception rooms awaiting their turn, why not put some good reading in said reception room for the improvement of the mind of the waiting person? Why not let him read "Nostrums and Quackery," published by the American Medical Association, price fifty cents, with your name stamped on the outside

cover? The inside story of many a swindle is told most interestingly; the true facts in regard to quackery that every one hears of and few people know the truth about, is here set forth. Many a physician who has this book in his office has been asked by patients, "May I take this home and read it?" Do something to help your patients educate themselves in how to avoid frauds. Leave the book on the table of your reception room, and then watch how many of your patients will voluntarily come to you and ask questions about the things therein written up, questions showing how eager they are to learn the truth about nostrums, quackery and frauds. Put it in your office and let the printed story do its work; this is one of the very few ways in which we, as a profession, can actually do something to educate the public without arousing their antagonism. You will find no better investment for fifty cents.

Under this caption the *Pasadena Daily News* has an editorial in its issue for March 22nd that is well worth reading.

PROTECTING A GULLIBLE PUBLIC. The News announces its policy in regard to fake and fraudulent "doctor"

advertisements. Here is a newspaper the owner of which does not wish to soil his hands with the dirty money—and such "easy money"—of the quack and the charlatan. He seems to be that rare animal, the owner of a newspaper and the possessor of a conscience! To determine just how rare this animal is, one has but to look through the advertisements in almost any newspaper. Speaking of the Seattle tragedy, in which a mad-dened lumberman who had been robbed and deluded by an advertising doctor named Akey (unfortunately one of the worst type, the licensed physician), shot Dr. Akey and his assistant and then shot himself, the *News* says:

"Participating in this double crime—that of advertising false healers and the consequent reprisal by an irate victim—is the publisher of every newspaper carrying the noxious announcements that lure men and women to their physical and financial undoing."

The *News* suggests that reputable physicians insert a simple professional card, stating briefly the specialty, and believes that this would induce most newspapers to throw out the quack advertising. The principal objection to physicians advertising in newspapers is the presence therein of the advertisements of quacks and fakes; and the well known inability of the public to determine the difference merely from an advertisement. If newspapers would publish only the advertisements of reputable physicians and rigidly exclude the other class, and let the public know it, there could be no reasonable objection to this form of advertising. In fact, it is the custom in a good many communities and is not looked upon as at all out of the way. Would that there were more newspapers like the *News*!